# Uncondo CP + NC Good

1. Counter-interpretation: Neg may defend a counterplan unconditionally under the Aff framework if it is won and the status quo unconditionally under my framework if it is won.

Reasons to prefer:

1. Neg ground

Limiting the Neg to one substantive out is awful: a) specificity of Aff plan means I’m just leveling the playing field—you should have to defend the desirability of your advocacy under the framework metric that you choose, b) Aff is infinitely more prepared to defend both their framework and advocacy, which means I’m behind either way. And, counterplans are obviously key: the core of debates is a comparison between the handgun ban and other policies like background checks. No one in the literature thinks the status quo is favorable. So testing both Aff framework and advocacy requires reading an NC framework *and* counterplan. However, Aff strategy puts me in a double bind: I either read a counterplan and concede the framework OR engage the framework and lose the contention. Otherwise I would be forced to read strange frameworks and counterplans since your interp requires consistency between the two e.g. if I read the stock liberty NC, no counterplan that isn’t anarchy would meet it [similarly if you read a narrow plan I would read a process counterplan but only a very odd framework would somehow justify a process counterplan but not the Aff.]

1. Real world

If you advocate for either poor ethics or a bad policy option we wouldn’t do it either way—real policymakers are accountable for both.

#### Girardin[[1]](#footnote-1)

As soon as it comes to large groups, associations, communities, regions, countries, relationships are structured, and ethics must reflect this. “Structured” means [be] embedded in institutions, rules, laws, policy objectives, provision of resources. Such “mediations” are the heart of politics. Constitutions often invoke ethics, since they are laying down principles, values, basic rights and higher norms. The preamble to the Swiss Constitution of 1999, for instance, specifies principles of freedom and solidarity to be realised down the road: “And in the knowledge that only those who use their freedom remain free, and that the strength of a people is measured by the well-being of its weakest members…” A constitution as a consolidated, written and published document is not a must – so far the UK has no such constitution. However, whatever the form, a set of principles, prerogatives, and hierarchies needs to be specified, covering sovereignty, the rule of law, a unitary or federal state, the respective prerogatives of the executive, legislature and judiciary, tenure, modes of designation, etc. A voting system may favour leadership through winner-takes-all or diversity through proportional representation. There is no perfect system, but a choice needs to be made. Policies and laws are not to be assessed merely by their intention or purpose. They aim at being broadly equitable, acceptable and just. Some laws that are overambitious in seeking equity are poorly implemented and end up in even less tolerable inequities. Laws inspired by some extreme solidarity – such as positive discrimination20 – are justified in specific cases to reach a critical mass and a sustainable threshold but may end up in inequitable privileges and reduced responsibility for marginal groups. A time limit should be set up front and act as a challenge. Laws should avoid being over-complex, inapplicable or poorly accepted. Some compromise at the expense of full justice may be accepted if that makes the law acceptable and enforceable. […] [One] A second dimension has to do with the regulatory framework for political processes. It is composed of a principal or constitutional frame, of laws, rules of the game and even customary uses. It shapes politics but may sometimes be mere window dressing, lip service or political ritual, far from concrete processes. [Another] The third dimension has to do with day-to-day management, setting priorities, settling conflicts, negotiating tradeoffs, processing and implementing policies and decisions, securing and delivering services, taking risks, mobilising resources, interacting with non-state actors.

This means I should be able to test both independently.

1. Gives Aff more flexibility and reset options—the 1AR would be screwed if I went for 7 minutes of a counterplan that solves your offense better or 7 minutes of framework layering that precluded access to your offense—my strategy gives you the possibility of collapsing to either the Aff versus status quo OR the Aff versus counterplan debate. You never have to win *both* the framework and the advocacy since there’s only one world I’m defending under either the Aff or the Neg framework.

## Frontlines

**AT Reciprocity - I have to win the framework and the contention while you just win one**

This is *definitely* reciprocal:

1. You can kick the AC framework, both of us just need to win our advocacy under whatever framework is true and I only have on advocacy under each framework.
2. The reciprocity issue you describe is nonunique—the same would be true if I went for case turns and a short NC.

**AT This is condo**

1. Cannot go for both options, it’s just contingent on the framework the judge thinks is winning or gets conceded to. Means my interp is basically the same as dispo with the status quo and CP as the defaults – but I can’t kick anything since I’m bound to each under their respective framework.
2. Could kick the AC framework in the 1ar or go for the aff – allows me to test the desirability of the framework and contention; only need to win one advocacy either way there is no reciprocity violation.

**AT I have to win framework and then beat the CP**

Nonunique—you would do this with any unconditional CP with a different ethic since you’d need to win your framework to even make the offense relevant when compared to the counterplan.

**AT Qualitative skew—you pick the best world under your fwk and mine**

1. Completely non-unique – you already can pick the best framework for the Aff advocacy that works together. I’m just doing the same.
2. Not responsive to my interp – that’s an indict of counterplans and NCs with no turn ground, not the practice itself.
3. Defending the status quo vis a vis the NC solves 100% of the abuse since that’s a shitty world to defend – everyone agrees the deaths in the status quo are a bad thing – means I’m not cherry-picking.
4. Doesn’t matter since in practice I would only get one world to defend since I can only go for either the CP or the status quo.
5. Perm solves – you can claim to defend the best possible aff world through many perms in the 1ar to KO neg offense.
6. Fiat of perfection occurs even if I read a short NC, CP under that framework that solved the aff, and then went to the AC. Your indict is not an indict of my practice, but of CPs in general but they’re key since […]

**AT Forces a contradiction**

No you just signpost against each option depending on which framework you are assuming during that part of a rebuttal speech.

**AT Split time**

1. You don’t have to—can go for the NC.
2. Nonunique—you would do this even if I went NC, AC.

## Notes

Explanation of ground standard:

(i) One substantive out bad, (ii) counterplan key (> case turns) HENCE -> I need both NC and CP to test the Aff

HOWEVER under your interp I would end up only able to read one or the other—that’s the double bind, but one substantive out is bad (already proven) OR I would read strange stuff to make NC and CP consistent, obviously uneducational SO -> let me read both a CP and an NC, under different frameworks.
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